

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

IN RE)	
INTEL CORPORATION)	
MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST)	MDL No. 1717-JJF
LITIGATION)	
<hr/>		
ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., a)	
Delaware corporation, and AMD)	
INTERNATIONAL SALES & SERVICES, LTD.,)	
a Delaware corporation,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	C.A. No. 05-441-JJF
v.)	
)	
INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,)	
and INTEL KABUSHIKI KAISHA, a Japanese)	
corporation,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		
PHIL PAUL, on behalf of himself)	
and all others similarly situated,)	C.A. No. 05-485-JJF
)	
Plaintiffs,)	CONSOLIDATED ACTION
)	
v.)	
)	
INTEL CORPORATION,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**STIPULATION WITHDRAWING SUBPOENAS DUCES TECUM TO POTOMAC
COUNSEL, LLC, DC NAVIGATORS, LLC AND PUBLIC STRATEGIES, LLC AND
RESTRICTING FUTURE DISCOVERY FROM CONSULTANTS RETAINED TO
INFLUENCE GOVERNMENT ACTION**

WHEREAS, on or about September 27, 2007, Intel Corp. and Intel Kabushiki Kaisiha (collectively "Intel") served subpoenas duces tecum on three consulting firms engaged to render

services on behalf of AMD; namely Potomac Counsel, LLC; DC Navigators, LLC; and Public Strategies, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, the subpoenas request the production of documents relating to (1) actual or potential litigation against Intel proposed or contemplated by AMD; (2) any possible or actual investigation of Intel by the United States or a foreign governmental entity; and (3) efforts by AMD to influence a government agency, including, but not limited to, any contracting or procurement officers of such an agency, to adopt certain specifications in Requests for Proposal (“RFP”) or Requests for Quotation (“RFQ”); and

WHEREAS, AMD represents that its relationship with Public Strategies, Inc. ended on or about October 30, 2004, prior to the date it contends it first reasonably anticipated that it would file a lawsuit against Intel, and that did not retain Potomac Counsel, LLC, until after it had commenced litigation against Intel; and

WHEREAS, AMD further represents that its lawsuit does not allege as a claim or part of the factual allegations supporting a claim Intel’s conduct to influence any public contracting or procurement agency to adopt technical specifications in Requests for Proposal (“RFP”) or Requests for Quotation (“RFQ”) favoring Intel over AMD and will not introduce evidence of such conduct in the case; and

WHEREAS, both parties agree not to serve or enforce subpoenas on any similar consulting firm retained by or on behalf of the other calling for the production of documents or testimony related to activities designed to influence government or agency action;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate that the subpoenas are withdrawn save and except that portion of the subpoena served

on DC Navigators, LLC (Requests 1 and 2), requiring production of documents tending to show that AMD reasonably anticipated filing its lawsuit against Intel prior to March 31, 2005.

RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.

By: /s/ Frederick L. Cottrell, III

Frederick L. Cottrell, III (#2555)

Chad M. Shandler (#3796)

Steven J. Fineman (#4025)

One Rodney Square

920 North King Street

Wilmington, DE 19899

(302) 651-7836

Cottrell@rlf.com

Shandler@rlf.com

Fineman@rlf.com

Attorneys for Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. and
AMD International Sales & Service, Ltd.

POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP

By: /s/ Richard L. Horwitz

Richard L. Horwitz (#2246)

W. Harding Drane, Jr. (#1023)

Hercules Plaza, 6th Floor

1313 N. Market Street

Post Office Box 951

Wilmington, D.E. 19890-0951

(302) 984-6000

rhorwitz@potteranderson.com

wdrane@potteranderson.com

Attorneys for Intel Corporation and Intel
Kabushiki Kaisha